

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Amendments to Claims and Abstract

The claims and abstract have been amended to correct various minor grammatical and idiomatic errors. Because the amendments to the claims abstract are all formal in nature, they do not involve “new matter.”

2. Rejection of Claims 1-22 Under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,340 (Brown)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Brown patent does not disclose compressing test data so that a “complete series of test data” can be stored in a memory until the memory is full, as recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 13. While Brown discloses compression of test data for storage in display memories 126, the display memories 126 of Brown do not correspond to the claimed memory because they do not store a “complete series of test data,” much less data for subsequent transmission to a computer “when the memory is full.” Instead, display memories 126 of Brown merely store “data as it will be displayed on display 111 of work station 110,” as explained in col. 3, lines 11-12.

Brown does disclose memories that correspond to the claimed memory, but the data supplied to the memories is not compressed. The memories that correspond to the claimed memory are in the form of “**a high speed catch RAM**” described in **lines 50-62 of col. 2** of the Brown patent. There is no disclosure that the high speed catch RAM, which is included in the pin electronics, stores compressed data. To the contrary, Brown only compresses data after it is retrieved from the catch memory for transmission to the display memories.

The reason that Brown discloses a *different structure* than the claimed structure (connection of the compressor **between** the **test data memory** and the **display memories** v.

connection of the compressor **between the test sample input and the test data memory**), as well as a *different manner of operation* (storing compressed data “as it will be displayed” v. storing test data from “**a complete series of tests**” until the test data memory is full, and then transferring the test data to computer), is that Brown is not concerned with saving space in local memory by compressing data, but rather seeks to increase the speed of data transfer to a display by appropriate formatting of the data being transferred from the catch RAM to the display memories. The Brown patent is apparently not concerned with catch RAM capacity, as therefore does not suggest the claimed solution of compressing data as it is input from the test sample.

Because the Brown patent fails to disclose or suggest compressing input data supplied to a test data memory, as claimed (as opposed to data transferred from the test data memory to display memories), and because the Brown patent does not disclose or suggest transferring data from the test data memory through a transmission interface when the test data memory is full (as opposed to caching data for display), it is respectfully submitted that the Brown patent does not *anticipate* the claimed invention, and therefore that the rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 USC §102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Having thus overcome the sole rejection made in the Official Action, expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Date: February 28, 2007

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500